

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
September 24-25, 2002 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council held a meeting commencing at 9:00 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Robert Atkinson | Chairman |
| 2. Pamela Connell | AT&T |
| 3. Wendy Potts | Bell Canada |
| 4. Randy Sanders | BellSouth |
| 5. Michael Altschul | CTIA |
| 6. Maureen Flood | CompTel |
| 7. Hon. Jo Anne Sanford | NARUC |
| 8. Greg Pattenaude | NARUC |
| 9. Peter Pescosolido | NARUC |
| 10. Helen Mickiewicz | NARUC |
| 11. Hon. Nancy Brockway | NARUC |
| 12. Natalie Billingsley | NASUCA |
| 13. Joel Cheskis | NASUCA |
| 14. Beth O'Donnell | NCTA |
| 15. James Goldstein | Nextel |
| 16. David Bench | Nortel Networks |
| 17. John McHugh | OPASTCO |
| 18. C. Courtney Jackson | OUR |
| 19. Deborah Bell | SBC Communications, Inc. |
| 20. Hoke Knox | Sprint |
| 21. Anna Miller | T-Mobile USA, Inc. |
| 22. Michael O'Connor | Verizon |
| 23. Karen Mulberry | WorldCom |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- | | |
|-----------------|-------|
| John Manning | NANPA |
| Jean-Paul Emard | ATIS |

Commission Employees:

- Sanford Williams, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Pam Slipakoff, Alternate DFO

Deborah Blue, Special Assistant to the DFO
Cheryl Callahan, Assistant Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division
Patrick Forster, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 37 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) July 17-18, 2002 NANC Meeting Minutes
- (3) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (4) Status of Area Code Relief Exhausting within 36 Months
- (5) INC Report to the NANC
- (6) Rationale for the Elimination of NANP Expansion Options by the INC
- (7) Number Pooling Cost Recovery
- (8) NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization IMG
- (9) Petition of the California PUC and the People of the State of California for Waiver of the FCC's Contamination Threshold Rule - NRO (CC Docket No. 99-200)
- (10) National Thousands Block Number Pooling Services
- (11) NANPA Oversight Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (12) LNPA Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (13) Wireless Number Portability Operations Status Report to the NANC
- (14) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Pooling Task Force Report
- (15) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (16) Cost Recovery Working Group Co-Chair Report to the NANC
- (17) NANC IMG Review of Intermediate Numbers

V. Summary of the Meeting.

A. Announcements and Recent News. Chairman Atkinson noted the following additions to the Agenda: (1) under Agenda Item 5, the Petition of the California PUC and the People of the State of California regarding increasing the threshold on contamination; (2) under Agenda Item 6, pooling cost recovery; and, (3) under Agenda Item 6, sending Change Orders to the NANC on Pooling Change Orders.

Chairman Atkinson presented a plaque to NARUC in recognition for their excellent performance in getting their members to respond to the 2001 NANPA Performance Review.

Chairman Atkinson conveyed a message from Tom Dunleavy thanking his NANC colleagues for the flowers and the many kind words expressed to him on the recent passing of his wife.

B. Approval of Minutes. Minutes of the July 17-18, 2002 NANC meeting were approved.

C. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report to the NANC. John Manning, NANPA, provided the report to the Council.

Central Office Code Activity Report. Mr. Manning reported that the total number of assignments for the first eight months of 2002 were 5,554 codes. Net assignments were 2,735 codes. He noted that in comparing the first eight months of 2002 with the same time period in 2001, assignments are down by 2,179 codes. The total returns in the first eight months of 2002 were 2,819 codes. Mr. Manning noted that in comparing the 2002 returns with the same time period in 2001, total returns are down by 1,339 codes. He stated that NANPA is still getting codes returned but not to the level that they experienced in the first eight months of 2001.

Changes in NPA Exhaust Projections. Mr. Manning stated that he will continue to provide to the NANC information concerning changes that are made by NANPA to an NPA code exhaust date, and that NANPA will post the changes to the NANPA web page. He further stated that NANPA will contact the state commission and address any questions they may have. Mr. Manning indicated that the only change in the latest report is in the 609 area code in New Jersey.

Mr. Manning reported that NANPA is presently reviewing forecast data recently made available by the Pooling Administrator on the demand for CO codes with the implementation of wireless pooling. NANPA is focusing primarily on those NPAs that are projected to exhaust in the near term (within the next 3 years) to determine if any adjustment in the forecasted exhaust data is warranted. It should be noted that the PA forecast only reflected the impact of wireless pooling on its need for CO codes over the next 12 months (through August 2003). With the next NRUF submission cycle (February 1, 2003), additional forecast information will be available from the service providers in which the PA will be able to provide a five year CO code forecast for pooling rate centers. This data will be used in developing individual NPA exhaust projections next year. The information will be posted to the NANPA web site. Notification will be sent to the NANC Chair and Ms. Blue to make sure that the NANC members are made aware that the information has been posted. Michael O'Connor, Verizon, suggested that NANPA provide information on which area codes are forecast to exhaust in less than one year so that the critical areas across the country may be highlighted for the NANC. Mr. Manning indicated that NANPA will provide the information.

NPA Relief Planning Status Report. Mr. Manning reviewed the chart on the status of area code relief exhaust over the next 36 months. He reported on a few updates to the chart and on other information that NANPA has added to the chart and other similar type reports so that the NANC members will understand what is going on in a particular NPA Relief Plan.

NPA Inventory Report. Mr. Manning stated that if an area code is to exhaust within the next 20 years, NANPA is required by the guidelines to identify and reserve a specific area code for relief of that NPA. Mr. Manning indicated that of the 260 general purpose codes remaining, 232 are now reserved, leaving 28 available. He noted that in July, 42 codes were available. Mr. Manning stated that the INC will examine whether or not additional NPA codes that are currently reserved need to be made available when the level of 28 falls below 20.

Nancy Brockway, NARUC, inquired what happens once the INC has been advised that the number of general purpose codes is going below 20. Mr. Manning stated that the INC will examine what area codes are not available today and determine whether or not those codes will be made available so that the supply of area codes is sufficient enough to make additional reservations if necessary. Ms. Brockway questioned where it is written that the INC makes this decision. Mr. Manning stated that he believes that it is in the NPA Allocation and Assignment Guidelines.

500 NPA Update. Mr. Manning stated that as of August 31, 2002, there are 529 500-NXX assignments/reservations. There are 259 codes 500-NXX codes available for assignment. There have been 62 500-NXX assignments from January 1 through August 31, 2002. Four 500-NXX codes have been returned/reclaimed in 2002. The rate of 500-NXX code assignments has gone down considerably to 5.33 codes per month. Based on this current monthly rate of assignment, the 500-NXX resource will exhaust in 48 months, or sometime in 2006.

NRUF Update – Adding FRN to Form 502. Mr. Manning advised that on September 13, 2002, NANPA was directed by the FCC to add an additional data element, the Federal Registration Number (FRN), to the NRUF Form 502. He explained that the FRN is a 10-digit number that is assigned to an entity that does business with the FCC. A filer, licensee, certificate holder, or any entity sending payments to the FCC is considered to be doing business with the FCC. Mr. Manning indicated that the FCC uses this FRN to determine if all of an entity's fees have been paid. He noted that it will be a required field. Mr. Manning advised that if the service provider fails to enter any information in the field, NANPA will reject the submission and inform the service provider that the FRN is required in order to have a valid NRUF on file. He stated that NANPA expects to have the revised Form 502 and associated FTP file formats updated and available approximately two months prior to the February 1, 2003 submission cycle.

Randy Sanders, BellSouth, inquired as to when NANPA will notify the service providers about the required FRN field. Mr. Manning pointed out that the FCC had requested that NANPA provide an estimate of any necessary costs associated with the modification to Form 502 prior to making any changes. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA has already responded to the FCC. Mr. O'Connor inquired about service providers with more than one FRN. Mr. Manning advised that only one FRN number that pertains to that service provider should be selected and entered on the form.

CAS/LERG Discrepancy Analysis. Mr. Manning reported that as part of NANPA's 2000 Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), NANPA has initiated a study and analysis of the discrepancies between the code information residing in NANPA's Code Administration System (CAS) and what is residing in the Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG). He advised that NANPA will devise a corrective action plan that can be instituted so that the data for code assignments in the CAS is similar or exactly the same as what is in the LERG. Mr. Manning explained that NANPA took a copy of the CAS data base of all code assignments as of August 1, 2002 and compared it to the August 1, 2002 copy of the LERG. He advised that the discrepancies were noted. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA found nearly 7500 mismatched records. He pointed out that over eighty percent of these records were done before the transition to NeuStar as the NANPA. Mr. Manning advised that because NANPA is dealing with old code assignments, there may be some issues with regard to its accuracy. He stated that out of the over 226,000 NXX assignment records that are in CAS, the 7500 records represent a little over 3% of the records.

Mr. Manning reviewed with the NANC a summary of NANPA's analysis and a proposed corrective action to be taken. He reported that the identified discrepancies were classified into seven categories. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA looked at three primary areas: (1) differences in the operating company number (OCN), associated with an NPA NXX; (2) differences between the code assignment status; and (3) where the Rate Center in CAS does not match the Rate Center in the LERG. Mr. Sanders stated that there seems to be errors in both the CAS and the LERG data bases. He questioned whether NANPA is cooperating with the LERG provider to get this sorted out. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA has not specifically contacted Telcordia about this problem. He indicated that the common denominator in NRUF, CAS and the LERG is the service provider. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA will go directly to the service provider, the party responsible for either reporting or updating the data, so that they can provide an assessment of the problem. He stated that based upon that information, if NANPA finds that both the LERG and NRUF are incorrect, then the service provider can take the necessary steps to get that information corrected.

After extensive discussion was held on the discrepancies that were identified between the CAS and the LERG data and the corrective actions on how to address and resolve these discrepancies, Mr. Manning advised that the corrective actions will be reviewed with the NOWG at its September 25, 2002 meeting.

4Q01 NeuStar Neutrality Audit. Mr. Manning provided the NANC with the 4th Quarter 2001 Neutrality Audit Report. He explained that it is the quarterly audit report of independent auditors concerning their findings with regard to NeuStar's compliance with the Neutrality Compliance Procedures.

D. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. David Bench, INC Moderator, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Bench announced that with the recent withdrawal of USTA from support of the NANC in the INC, Ms. Dana Smith of Verizon will serve as Assistant INC Moderator. He reviewed the INC meeting schedule with the NANC.

Mr. Bench reported that at the request of the LNPA WG, INC updated its guidelines to accommodate wireless Type 1 to Type 2 block transfers. He further reported that to accommodate wireless pooling, INC updated its guidelines relating to the block activation interval. The Pooling Administration System (PAS) will have to be modified and INC supports such modification, depending on the price tag.

Mr. Bench reported on an issue related to Block Forecasting. He stated that PAS was built to reject a block application if the blocks requested exceed the forecast for that month, even if only by one block. The guidelines, according to Mr. Bench, allow service providers to be assigned incremental blocks if available in the pool, but PAS does not allow the assignment of incremental blocks unless the service provider modifies its forecast on the spot. Service providers believe that PAS should have been built with flexibility to accommodate forecast estimates within a fluid six-month window. Mr. Bench reviewed an example of a Forecasting Chart and Recommendation with the NANC. Ms. Mickiewicz questioned what the problem is with revising the forecast on the spot, as opposed to redesigning the system to accommodate a rolling six-month forecast. Mr. Bench stated that the requestor may not necessarily be the forecaster. He further stated that it produces double work. Chairman Atkinson opined that one solution would be to forecast one hundred per month. He questioned whether there is any reason not to do that. Mr. Bench stated that he is sure that there are service providers that do forecast that level because their demand is at that level. Chairman Atkinson questioned what is the implication to the system if service providers started to over forecast to protect themselves. Mr. Bench responded that the system would be supplying a much larger pool than it would need to supply in any given area.

Extensive discussion was held regarding the INC request that the NANC recommend to the FCC that the PAS be modified to accommodate forecast estimates within a fluid six-month window.

Mr. Bench explained that the issue was brought in by a single CLEC. He stated that in working the issue, the INC found out that the problem was more wide-spread. Mr. Bench indicated that the guidelines only require an update of forecast if there is a significant change in the forecast. He stated that this was deemed by the INC, in working this issue, a policy issue. Therefore, the issue was brought before the NANC. Chairman Atkinson questioned whether the INC feels like the system has not been built to the specification. Mr. Bench responded that the INC feels that the system has not been built per the guidelines. Chairman Atkinson stated that the NANC would have to take a look at the specification and the system and reach that conclusion. He questioned whether the NANC should write a letter to the FCC stating that the FCC needs to check and see whether the contract was fulfilled. Mr. Williams responded that questions concerning compliance with the specifications would be addressed with the Contracting Officer.

After further extensive discussion, consensus was reached that the Oversight Working Group (OWG) will consider the allegation made by INC that the PAS does not fulfill the

technical specification requirements and that the OWG will make a recommendation to the NANC as soon as possible by e-mail.

Mr. Bench reported on the CO/NXX Workshop. He stated that to address the concerns expressed by state PUCs, INC revised its guideline text on deadlines for code assignment prior to pool start dates. Mr. Bench expressed appreciation to Christine Sealock Kelly from the New York PSC for her thoughtful input and participation at the INC meeting on behalf of the states.

Rationale for the Elimination of NANP Expansion Options by the INC. Norman Epstein, Verizon, reported on why certain proposals were not included in the NANP Expansion Options Document prepared by the INC. Chairman Atkinson stated that there is no immediate need to implement an expansion plan because the crisis is somewhat over. He asked the NANC members to keep in mind that by the time an expansion plan will need to be considered, probably 10 or more years from now, there probably will be 20 to 30 better ideas or new technology.

Mr. Epstein gave an overview of the INC evaluation/selection process. He stated that the INC identified the best expansion plan options. Mr. Epstein explained that the plans were developed from input by INC members as well as various other sources such as users of telephone numbers, private citizens, companies, and the FCC. Mr. Epstein stated that the INC did not restrict any input from any particular party. All plans were treated equally. Certain assumptions and constraints were applied to all plans. INC had its own objective and subjective assessment criteria. Mr. Epstein stated that the plans that made it through the screening process had to be implementable, e.g., dialing plan, transition plan, etc.

Mr. Epstein reviewed the rationale for the elimination of NANP Expansion Options 2A, 3A, 4A, and the Steering Code Proposal with the NANC.

E. Number Pooling Cost Recovery. Deena Shetler, Deputy Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, and Christopher Barnekov, Economist, Pricing Policy Division, reviewed with the Council, a report of the relevant Orders and relevant standards for number pooling cost recovery. Chairman Atkinson informed the NANC members that the number pooling cost recovery issue had been raised by Phil McClelland, NASUCA. Ms. Shetler discussed two important decisions. One decision was how the costs would be recovered. There were two choices: (1) put it in an end-user charge, similar to what was done with Local Number Portability cost recovery; or (2) put it into access. She stated that the distinction that was made in the Order was about the purpose of the two distinct numbering requirements. Number Portability was primarily a competitive requirement that did not go to basic network functionality. A determination was made in that an end-user charge was the appropriate way to recover the cost of Local Number Portability. Access was the means of cost recovery chosen for number pooling. The basis for it was that numbering is a basic network functionality, and that maintaining the current North American Numbering Plan is something which benefits the entire network. The choice was made that these federal costs would go into the normal FCC's mechanism for recovering costs, which is access. The second decision addressed what

costs are recoverable. Ms. Shetler discussed the three-pronged test used in determining what costs are eligible for recovery: (1) only costs that would not have been incurred “but for” thousands-block number pooling; (2) only costs incurred “for the provision of” thousands-block number pooling; and (3) only “new” costs. Ms. Shetler and Mr. Barnekov further reviewed with the Council issue regarding costs, why recovery was permitted through access, and how costs flow through access.

Joel Cheskis, NASUCA, expressed concern regarding the procedure in which pooling cost recovery was allowed, including why the NANC was not advised of the tariff filings prior to the companies’ filings. Mr. Cheskis indicated that an adequate opportunity to comment on the filings was not provided to the public. Michael O’Connor, Verizon, advised that the costs were a matter of the public record on at least two or three separate occasions on major filings at the FCC with regard to Numbering Resource Optimization.

Mr. Cheskis requested an action item regarding the impact of this cost recovery approval on individual access lines. Chairman Atkinson stated that if a decision had not already been made, then the NANC might have some relevant use for that information. He further stated that unless it is related to some ongoing NANC agenda item or decision that the NANC has been asked to look at, he is reluctant to have anybody doing work for NANC when the work cannot be used as part of a decision-making process.

F. NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization IMG (NENO). Penn Pfautz, AT&T, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Pfautz reported that the NENO had to delay presenting its final report in order to incorporate further analysis of the extent of benefits that it expects to get out of the various optimization measures. He advised that the NENO is at the point that it has an analysis predicting the benefit for each of the measures. The NENO is trying to agree on the details of the discussion and proper caveating of those results. Mr. Pfautz stated that the NENO expects completion of its final report prior to the November NANC meeting.

G. Petition of the California Public Utilities Commission and the People of the State of California for Waiver of the Federal Communications Commission’s Contamination Threshold Rule. Chairman Atkinson stated that the FCC would like to get a NANC recommendation on the petition. He questioned which part of the NANC would be able to review and provide some input or commentary on whether changing the contamination rate from 10 to 25% as proposed by California is good or bad and make a recommendation. Ms. Mulberry proposed that an independent IMG be created to focus solely on whatever action item the FCC has assigned to the NANC. Mr. O’Connor agreed. Ms. Mickiewicz stated that she is puzzled as to why a filing by the state of California is being brought before the NANC, and a working group is being suggested to respond to it. Cheryl Callahan, Assistant Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, advised that the FCC intends to put the petition out for public comment. She further advised that the FCC is interested in getting the technical expertise that it needs, as it has done in the past, from the NANC. Ms. Callahan stated that it was not intended to put California on the spot to have a personal examination of a public filing.

Chairman Atkinson questioned whether the FCC wants an official NANC view as opposed to the views of individual NANC members. Ms. Callahan stated that the FCC wants both since it will be going out for public comment. She indicated that the FCC expects individuals to file publicly on the record as well. She also stated that the FCC expects to have a request in the Public Notice for the NANC to provide technical input. Ms. Mickiewicz expressed concern that forming a working group could result in delay. She stated it takes time to set up a working group, it has to get going, and then it has to produce a result, which could take up to a year. Ms. Mickiewicz indicated that the California PUC was hoping to get a response in a shorter time frame. Chairman Atkinson proposed that the NANC wait until the Public Notice has been released and then form an IMG based specifically on what the FCC asks the NANC to do. Beth O'Donnell opined that it would be more efficient to form an IMG right away. She stated that some questions could be answered regardless of what the FCC requests.

After extensive discussion, an IMG was formed, comprised of representatives from Worldcom, Verizon, Sprint, SBC, NCTA, the California PUC, CTIA, AT&T, and the PA. Beth O'Donnell will serve as Interim Chair. The IMG will provide the NANC with a recommendation prior to the November NANC meeting so that the NANC can adopt, modify, or reject the recommendation at the November NANC meeting.

Ms. Mickiewicz expressed concern that the California PUC is put in the awkward position of answering to the industry that it regulates. Chairman Atkinson stated that the duty of the NANC working group is to be helpful to the FCC. Ms. Brockway remarked that this is a very sad day and expressed disappointment with the way that things turned out. She commented that the NANC is an organization that has not, heretofore, been able to agree on important matters in a rapid manner. Mr. Williams stated that the FCC's decision will not be predicated solely on what the NANC recommends. He indicated that the NANC is a federal advisory council to the FCC and is one of the many viewpoints that the FCC is seeking.

H. Presentation by National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator (PA).

Barry Bishop, NeuStar, provided the report to the Council. Mr. Bishop stated that since the implementation of the national rollout began on January 4, 2002, there have been 56 First Implementation Meetings (FIMs) for 71 NPAs (85 NPAs including overlays and splits in permissive dialing). The FIMs for the 3rd Quarter of the rollout schedule were completed on August 8, 2002. The FIMs for the 4th Quarter of the rollout began on September 4, 2002 and are expected to be completed by October 17, 2002. The schedule for the 5th Quarter of the rollout is expected to be posted by mid-November 2002.

Mr. Bishop provided an update on wireless pooling implementation. He reported that the PA received the forecasts donations that were due on August 14, 2002. A conference call was held for state commissions on August 15, 2002 to update them on the wireless transition to number pooling. The PA Assessment of all pools including wireline and wireless was completed on September 4, 2002. It is available on the pooling administrator's website. It was updated on September 13, 2002 to include the first month

donations would run out, requiring that a code be opened. A conference call with the Wireless Task Force to discuss the assessment was held September 10, 2002. A list of missing forecasts and donations was sent to the FCC on September 19, 2002. Intra-SP ports and donations are due to be completed on November 1, 2002. The first date to apply for a block is November 4, 2002. Wireless SPs may be assigned a block before November 24, 2002 for testing purposes. The test block will be returned. Two conference call meetings were held on August 15, 2002 and September 11, 2002 with the California wireless industry to discuss issues associated wireless grandfathering in a number pooling environment. Issues discussed included: impacts on moving the grandfathered wireless codes into rate centers that are consistent with their NPAs, 911, customer-affecting issues, technical issues, any other carrier-affecting issues, and suggestions for alternatives to moving the codes.

Mr. O'Connor opined that all of the states with grandfather codes are not going to be able to solve the problems prior to November 24, 2002. He stated that it may be appropriate for the NANC to send a letter to the FCC advising them that this is going to be an issue. Mr. O'Connor proposed that the industry should seek a waiver from the FCC in order to get a little more time to hold the few codes that are grandfathered in abeyance in a special category until they can work with regulators to find the right answers as to what to do with the codes. Ms. Mickiewicz explained that on November 24, 2002, the codes that carriers have that are grandfathered in rate centers that are geographically outside the NPA where the codes should reside, cannot be pooled or ported. She emphasized that the problem has to be resolved. Chairman Atkinson stated that right now, every wireless carrier is obligated to meet the November 24, 2002 deadline or face FCC enforcement. Deborah Bell, SBC, stated that this is not a wireless exclusive issue. She further stated that they are wireless codes, but they definitely have impacts that affect wireline carriers. Mr. Bishop stated that he concurred with Ms. Bell's assessment. Chairman Atkinson expressed doubt that the NANC has the standing to ask for waivers. Mr. O'Connor advised that the NANC could write a letter to the FCC indicating that the industry has identified this as a problem, and the industry or individual carriers may seek a waiver. Ms. Mulberry stated that she does not think that sufficient information has been given for the NANC to write a letter.

After extensive discussion it was decided a letter would be drafted to the FCC explaining the scope and the implications regarding grandfathered codes on industry, on consumers, etc. CTIA, SBC, Verizon, AT&T, and the California PUC volunteered to draft the letter.

Mr. Bishop indicated that the PA also has concerns and will be sending the FCC a note independently of the NANC.

Mr. Bishop reported that one new Change Order was filed with the FCC on September 18, 2002 – Change Order #16 – changes to the Thousands Block Pooling Administration Guidelines (TBPAG). He reported on the outstanding Change Orders: Change Order #6 – CO NXX Issue #295 – change to Selection Process of Code Holder; Change Order #7 – PAS Security; Change Order #10 – LNPA Issue #319 – “Intra-SP Porting for Rate Center Telephone Number Administration”; Change Order #11 – CO/NXX Issue #195 – “Final

Jeopardy Procedures”; Change Order #12 – changes to the TBPAG; Change Order #13 – Modification to User Profile Application Appendix 5; Change Order #14 – Modify Part 3 Form in TBPAG; and Change Order #15 – Update MTE in COCAG.

Mr. Bishop reviewed with the NANC, the August and September 2002 Thousands Block Pooling Reports, and System Performance Reports for August and September 2002 that were submitted to the FCC by the PA. These reports are pursuant to the Requirements Document, in which monthly reports are submitted to the FCC by the 15th of each month. Mr. Bishop stated that a survey regarding the PA’s performance during the 2nd Quarter of 2002 was distributed to industry and regulatory contacts on August 8, 2002. Of the 50 surveys returned, 41 were from industry and 9 were from state regulatory staff.

Chairman Atkinson stated that the NANC was asked to consider whether Change Orders to the Pooling Administrator should first go through the NANC. Mr. Williams stated that the Contracting Officer for the PA Contract has been working on language which would combine what the NANC can do pursuant to the contract and what the NOWG had done previously. He advised that as soon as he receives it from the Contracting Officer, it will be provided to the NANC members. Mr. Williams indicated that one of the things that the Contracting Officer is looking to change is to have the NANC look at Change Orders. He advised that the new working group will ultimately be getting directions from the FCC to look at the Change Orders that have come in and make a recommendation to the FCC. Chairman Atkinson questioned whether the working group will report directly back to the FCC or actually report through the NANC every other month. He expressed concern with the time frame. Mr. Williams opined that the most efficient way would be for the working group to report back to him, the Contracting Officer, and Ms. Blue. Ms. Blue will then send out an email informing the NANC of the recommendation. Mr. Williams stated that the new NANPA/PA Working Group will have that oversight as one of their responsibilities. Mr. Sanders questioned whether the NANC will see the price of the Change Order as well. Mr. Williams responded yes.

I. NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report. Karen Mulberry, WorldCom, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Mulberry announced that the NOWG met on July 18th and selected two new Co-Chairs for NANC’s review and confirmation. The two Co-Chairs are Karen Mulberry, WorldCom and Jim Castagna, Verizon. Ms. Mulberry provided the NANC members with a listing of the NOWG’s current responsibilities and identified what they are focused on.

Ms. Mulberry stated the NOWG felt that the new working group would be responsible for: Change Orders – provide summary to the NANC; Internal Performance Metrics – review/identify deficiencies; Complaints – review/identify areas in need of improvement; PIPs – Co-develop plans, monitor progress and closure; and, Performance Review – annual performance evaluation. Ms. Mulberry explained that the NOWG did not define how the new working group will interact. It will follow whatever instructions that are given. Chairman Atkinson commented that it would be useful for the NANC to transform the NOWG into a Number Administration Oversight Working Group (NAOWG) with the charter and the functions that have been outlined by the NOWG in

Attachment 2 of the NOWG Report. It will be subject to the process established for reviewing Change Orders. If there is not a strong consensus at the working group level, then the NANC will get involved in the actual review of the Change Order. Ms. Mulberry stated that in either case, the NAOWG will keep the NANC informed.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that the NANC would constitute the NAOWG along the lines as reflected in Attachment 2 of the NOWG Report.

Ms. Mulberry reviewed the Status of the NANPA 2002 Performance Improvement Plan with the NANC members. She also reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule.

Mr. Bishop announced that the PA will not attend any of the oversight working group meetings until they are authorized through negotiations with the Contracting Officer.

J. Local Number Portability Report (LNPA). Paul Lagattuta, AT&T, provided the report to the Council. Mr. Lagattuta stated that NeuStar reported the Release 3.2 Project Plan is on schedule. The LNPA expects to start testing Release 3.2 on March 4, 2003. The first regional is expected to go on line using Release 3.2 on April 28, 2003. Mr. Lagattuta advised that the LNPA is starting to look into the next release. They are looking at performance and throughput. Some of the issues that are being looked at by the LNPA are: enhancements to the message flow mechanism, which involve some buffer issues; and the elimination of association aborts. The LNPA is looking at increasing the timers to see what can be done to change the current situation. Mr. Lagattuta reviewed the PIM report with the Council.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO Report to the NANC. James Grasser, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Grasser reported that the WNPO met on Monday, September 16, and Tuesday, September 17, 2002. He stated that a contribution regarding trouble reporting procedures and contact lists was discussed. Several contact lists exist, but not all are available for every service provider to use. The various lists will be researched and results will be brought back to WNPO in October. There was discussion on preparedness for pooling and porting and the fact that not all wireless switches have codes homed on them in the LERG. Service providers must plan ahead and request codes for these switches so that LRNs can be selected and will be available when needed.

As a result of the August LNPA WG meeting, the wireless reseller flows and narratives needed to be revised and a fourth flow and narrative needed to be developed. During this effort, all four flows were consolidated into a single flow with a single narrative. This single flow and narrative was reviewed and accepted by all members and was forwarded on to the LNPA WG.

The matrix of revised Help Desk Hours, Long Business Day Timers and Service Provider Maintenance Windows was reviewed. Information was requested from NeuStar for the October meeting regarding the number of "after hours" calls that they receive so that WNPO can make a decision on the Help Desk Hours; the Long Business Day Timers can

be reset quite easily; the change in time for the Service Provider Maintenance Windows will be verified with the LNPA WG. The driver for this activity is that wireless LNP has been delayed for 12 months. The WNPO wants to ensure that changes that are needed for pooling will still be completed, but if changes are not needed or required, then they can be delayed until next year.

NeuStar provided an update: a total of 36 wireless service providers have signed NDAs/Applications with NeuStar; a total of 27 wireless service providers have filed an interconnection plan with NeuStar; all service providers and service bureaus who have notified NeuStar that they want to perform new-entrant testing have completed their testing; as of Friday, September 13th, there has not been a significant increase in NPAC transactions due to intra-service provider porting in preparation for pooling. An issue regarding Type 1 number migrations (Issue 373) was opened at INC as a result of discussions that began at WNPO earlier this year. This issue requested a change to the rules for transfer of ownership of thousands blocks to accommodate moving blocks of "Type 1 numbers" from the wireline service provider to the wireless service provider who actually uses the numbers. This issue was accepted, and the Thousands-Block Number Pooling Administration Guidelines has been modified. An effort is underway to identify the wireless service providers who have licenses that include the top 100 MSAs. This work should be completed by the October meeting. The Wireless Testing Subcommittee provided an update of testing that is currently occurring and revisions to the test schedule. The testing sub-committee will submit a high-level report of the testing that takes place in each MSA – the first report will be for the Las Vegas MSA. Seven MSAs have been confirmed for inter-carrier testing prior to November 24, 2002 – the pooling implementation date. Inter-carrier testing has started in the Orlando, Florida, MSA. Mr. Grasser provided the updated Implementation Guideline and Narrative to the Council.

Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNPSC) Pooling Task Force Report. Anna Miller, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Miller reported that the WNPSC conducted a July 24, 2002 conference call to address Pooling Transition clarification questions. The Pooling Administrator (PA) distributed a timeline for wireless catch up NPAs requiring Forecast and Donation Reports. There was an agreement that per the First Implementation Meeting (FIM), if the forecast due date was after August 14, 2002, the forecast could be submitted on the later due date or August 14, 2002 (for NPAs with Pool Start Dates prior to November 24, 2002). The Pooling Administration System (PAS) is available for use. It was available for use for the August 14, 2002 Forecast and Donation Reports for non-Native Block Pooling NPAs. Starting November 4, 2002, it will be available for Thousands-Block applications. By February 1, 2003, it will be available for the Semi-Annual Forecasts.

Ms. Miller reported that the WNPSC conducted a September 10, 2002 conference call to go over the Pooling Administrator Assessment Report. The PA distributed a report of all NPAs/rate centers with deficiencies (i.e. where NXXs must be ordered) for both the wireline and wireless industry. The report is sorted by NPA, the number of wireless carriers with NXXs, the number submitting Forecast Reports, and the number of wireless

carriers submitting Donation Reports. A clarification was made by the PA that even if there were no donations, the carrier should notify the PA via e-mail, and the Assessment would be updated. A timeline of Pooling transition activities was reviewed, noting that for NXXs needed in December 2002, the PA must select a LERG assignee by September 18, 2002; 20 NXXs requiring December activation were identified. Concern was expressed over the ability of the PA to be assigned jeopardy NPAs given the various state procedures.

Ms. Miller stated that all of the action items with the exception of a follow-up conference call in October 2002 had been completed. A notice regarding the agreement that the Forecast Report due date was August 14, 2002 was distributed by the Pooling Task Force and CTIA, and posted on the NeuStar number pooling web site. By September 13, 2002, all wireless carriers were to notify the PA of any NPAs/rate centers that had zero donations, if Donation Reports were not submitted. By September 16, 2002, the PA would update the Pooling Assessment Report to accurately reflect wireless donations. A conference call is scheduled for October 22, 2002 to address any LERG assignee or other Transition issues.

K. North American Portability Management (NAPM), LLC Report. Release 3.2 – Number Portability Administration Center/Service Management System (NAPC) Release 3.2 is currently under development and on schedule for testing on March 4, 2003.

L. NBANC Report. Maripat Brennan provided the report to the Council. Ms. Brennan explained that at the March 13, 2002 Board Meeting, the NBANC Board discussed the fund balance that had accumulated during the last couple of years. The accumulation occurred because NBANC had been directed to start collecting for Pooling Administration, carrier audits, and COCUS, yet they had not paid much out for these activities. Several million dollars have accumulated, and the discussion centered around the best way to handle that fund balance. The Board decided that to assure consistency for planning purposes for the carriers, NBANC would take a portion of that balance and use it to maintain the contribution factor at the same level of the last couple of years, which was 0.000043. At the time of the annual filing in May, the projected balance was \$7.7 million. The decision was to use \$3.25 million to reduce the 2002/2003 contribution requirement. NBANC would then have \$4.4 million that could be used to reduce future funding requirements. Ms. Brennan indicated that this change was explained in the May filing, which was available for comments. She stated that no comments were received.

Ms. Brennan reported that as of August 31, 2002, there is a current fund balance of \$6.23 million. The receivables for 2002 are \$4.63million. Of that total U.S. carriers owe \$4.48 million. Payments to NeuStar for NANPA and CO Code Administration – \$5.4 million; Year to date - \$878 Thousand; Remaining - \$4.53 Million. Payments to NeuStar for Pooling Administrator - \$4.1 Million projection, \$3.9 Million 1st year contract. June 2001 to date - \$3.28 Million; July 2002 to date - \$584 Thousand; Remaining - \$615 Thousand. Payments to NeuStar for Pooling Administrator for 2002 – 2003 -\$307 Million; Remaining - \$307 Million. Payments to NANPA Auditor - \$700 Thousand;. Year to date - \$177 Thousand; Remaining - \$523 Thousand. Payments for COCUS

Replacement - \$203 Thousand; Remaining - \$203 Thousand. Payments to Mitre Corp. – September 15, 2002 Letter Contract for PA procurement and NANPA equitable adjustment; Year to date - \$1,670.82 for PA; Year to date - \$360.36 for NANPA. February 6, 2002 Contract for NANPA procurement - \$288 Thousand; Year to date - \$140 Thousand; Remaining - \$148 Thousand. Payments to NECA for 2002-2003 - \$351 Thousand. Year to date - \$52 Thousand; Remaining - \$299 Thousand. Payments for Board Expenses for 2002-2003 - \$25 Thousand; Remaining \$25 Thousand. Payments to External Auditor, Withum Smith & Brown, Auditor of 2001-2002 Operations - \$29 Thousand; Remaining - \$28,680.

M. Cost Recovery Working Group (CRWG). Anne La Lena, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Ms. La Lena noted that there have not been any projects before the group. Ms. La Lena advised that the CRWG does undertake ad hoc projects typically of a cost allocation or financial nature as directed by the Council. She stated that past CRWG projects included the following activities: Development of a cost-allocation formula recommendation for all member countries participating in the North American Numbering Plan (NANP); development of allocation formula recommendations for number administration and pooling costs for U.S. carriers; creation of the original and then the updated Requirements Document for the NANP billing and collection function; Estimation of a high-level cost for COCUS replacement for NBANC's billing and collecting purposes; and, recommendation of a reduction in the allocation factor for U.S. carriers when funds collected for pooling administration outpaced by far its implementation costs. Ms. La Lena stated that the active membership of the CRWG is composed of: AT&T, WorldCom, and Verizon. She noted that there are a few other interested observers. Anna Miller questioned whether there is a mission and scope associated with the CRWG. Ms. La Lena responded not to her recollection.

N. Report of E-Conferencing Subcommittee. No report at this time.

O. Report of the NANC Intermediate Numbering/Soft Dial Tone (IN/SDT) IMG. Deborah Bell, SBC, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Bell reported that the IN/SDT IMG looked at the Codes of Federal Regulations (CFR), Numbering Resource Optimization Orders (NRO), and the latest NRUF job aid and pulled out definitions for intermediate numbers. She indicated that the FCC defined Intermediate Numbers in CFR 47 Sec. 52.15(f)(1)(v) as: Intermediate numbers are numbers that are made available for use by another telecommunications carrier or non-carrier entity for the purpose of providing telecommunications service to an end user or customer. Numbers ported for the purpose of transferring an established customer's service to another service provider shall not be classified as intermediate numbers. Ms. Bell reported that there is also a definition of Inventory in CFR 47 Sec. 52.7(j): The term "inventory" refers to all telephone numbers distributed, assigned or allocated to: (1) a service provider; or (2) a pooling administrator for the purpose of establishing or maintaining a thousands-block number pool. She gave the definition of a Secondary Inventory that was established in FCC 00-104, paragraph 20: some carriers maintain an intermediate, i.e., secondary inventory of numbering resources for the purpose of providing numbers to other carriers (e.g., resellers) and non-carrier entities (e.g., retail dealers and unified messaging service

providers). Ms. Bell stated that on June 1, 2002 the IN/SDT IMG received the NRUF Job Aid. The Job Aid indicates that resold numbers should not be considered intermediate numbers because the intermediate classification only applies to blocks of numbers obtained from or given to another carrier or non-carrier entity for future assignment.

Ms. Bell stated that as the IN/SDT IMG found that there are a number of different interpretations of intermediate numbers. She noted that there has been an ongoing disparity in the treatment of intermediate numbers. Ms. Bell gave a few examples of interpretations from participants and other industry members that were willing to state their assumptions with regard to intermediate numbers. Interpretation A – INs do not exist because there is only one numbering inventory; the FCC defines INs as a secondary inventory. Numbers used by resellers are not INs because they are pulled from the same inventory and the status of the numbers is known at all times. INs should be removed from the denominator when utilization is calculated for the MTE worksheet. Ms. Bell noted the following: Interpretation C – All TNs designated to Type 1 providers are considered INs. Numbers used by resellers are not INs because they are pulled from the same inventory and the status of the numbers is known at all times. INs are included in the denominator for utilization on the MTE worksheet. However, these numbers are not available to end-user customers. For NRUF, INs are reported with the other provider's name.

Ms. Bell reviewed a few more interpretations with the Council. She stated that the list of examples is a summary and not a comprehensive list of all of the interpretations that are out there.

The IMG agreed on the following points: A clarified definition of INs that is clearly understood by SPs, the NANC, the NANPA, and the FCC would facilitate any meaningful information and correct any disparities that currently exist; the industry's best efforts to correctly interpret INs according to the NRO Orders result in disparate results that provide questionable benefit to the industry or the FCC; there is confusion over primary versus secondary inventories and carrier versus non-carrier entities; the industry prefers to treat INs the same for both the NRUF and the MTE utilization calculation; NRUF automatically excludes INs from the denominator of the formula and the MTE should be treated the same. It is also noted that the nascent advent of Wireless Number Portability may cause a significant reduction in the number of Type 1 arrangements between carriers. Therefore, should the IMG's proposed definition of INs be accepted, the instances of carriers maintaining second inventories would be reduced.

The IN/SDT IMG provided three recommendations. First, the IN/SDT IMG would like the following modified definition of intermediate numbers to replace CFR 47 Sec. 52.15(f)(1)(v): Intermediate numbers are included in numbers assigned by the national administrator (NANPA or PA) to a carrier (Party A) that in turn establishes a secondary inventory of numbers dedicated for use by another entity (Party B) responsible for the assignment of the numbers to end-user customers. Therefore, the numbers are not available to Party A for assignment to its end-user customers. Second, the IN/SDT IMG

recommends that for NRUF purposes, the SP receiving the resource directly from NANPA/PA should identify the codes or blocks that under the assignment control of another or secondary entity. The OCN of the secondary entity should be required. A threshold of INs should be established to determine whether the receiving entity must file an NRUF. Quantities below that threshold are not deemed sufficient enough to warrant any reporting. If no NRUF is required, regulators having concerns over how these numbers are being used should pursue an audit. The NRUF calculation that excludes INs should remain as is. Third, for the Utilization Calculation on the MTE Worksheet, the IN/SDT IMG suggests two alternatives: (1) 'Intermediate Numbers' should be designated by the FCC to be a sub-category of 'Assigned'. The SP receiving the resource directly from NANPA designates in internal systems that these TNs are NOT available for assignment to end-user customers and are NOT available for its own internal use; or (2) 'Intermediate Numbers' remains a standalone category and is specifically itemized as being removed from the denominator of the utilization formula.

Chairman Atkinson asked the Council members to consider whether any revisions to the report are going to be necessary. He questioned how quickly does the NANC need FCC action. Ms. Bell responded that the IN/SDT IMG is trying to get something in place for the February 2003 filing. After extensive discussion, it was decided that at the November meeting the IN/SDT IMG will present to the NANC any updates based on the discussions held and present it in a format that can be transmitted as is to the FCC with very clear recommendations.

Chairman Atkinson stated that it is a very good report. Ms. Brockway thanked the IN/SDT IMG for a tremendous job in clarifying what has obviously been a complex and confusing issue. She expressed appreciation for all of the hard work of the IMG.

P. Other Business. Chairman Atkinson requested a volunteer to maintain the Table of NANC Projects for the NANC. Ms. Bell volunteered.

Q. Public Participation. None.

Next Meeting: January 22, 2003

**September 24, 2002
NANC Meeting**

Action Items and Decisions Reached:

1. Pooling Administration System (PAS).

Action Item:

The Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group (NAOWG) will compare the PAS with the technical specification in response to the INC's allegation that the PAS does not satisfy the specification. The NAOWG will

report its findings and recommend a course of action to the NANC as quickly as possible via e-mail.

Action Item:

The Pooling Administrator should review both the allegation and the NAOWG's report at the November NANC meeting.

2. California PUC's Petition for Waiver of FCC Contamination Threshold.

Action Item:

An IMG will provide the NANC with a technical evaluation of the California petition as soon as possible prior to the November NANC meeting. The IMG will be chaired by NCTA and be comprised of the CPUC, Verizon, Worldcom, Sprint, SBC, CTIA, AT&T, and the PA.

3. Waiver of Wireless Pooling for Grandfathered Codes Outside NPA.

Action Item:

By October 26, an IMG composed of CTIA, the CPUC, AT&T, Verizon, and SBC will circulate to the NANC members a draft of a letter from the NANC Chair to the FCC with a recommendation.